

REMARKS

Claims 1-33 were previously canceled.

Claims 42-45 have been canceled in this Amendment. Even though Applicant has canceled claims 42-45 herein, Applicant is not conceding that these claims are not patentable over the cited Prior Art. Rather, the amendments herein are made to facilitate expeditious allowance of the present patent application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue broader claims in a continuation and/or divisional patent application.

New claims 46-53 have been presented above.

Claims 34-41 were rejected under 35 USC 103 based on Horn (US Published Patent Application 2002/0198962) in view of Jannette (US Patent 6,036,345). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection based on the following:

Claim 34 recites a method for displaying a web browsing history. A list of names of web sites visited by a user are displayed. The list of web site names are displayed in an order based on a time since last visit by the user to the respective web site. Next to each of the web site names is displayed a respective graphic whose intensity corresponds to the time since last visit by the user to each named web site.

Horn discloses, “When the Include History button 32 is selected from function Home Form 28 (FIG. 10), operation of the function History 44 as set forth in the form of FIG. 11 is the result. The form displays browser history stored URLs by date visited.” Horn Paragraph [0112]. Horn does not disclose or suggest that next to each of the web site names is displayed a respective graphic whose intensity corresponds to the time since last visit by the user to each named web site, as recited in claim 34. The Examiner acknowledges this gap in Horn, and cites Jannette as purportedly filling this gap.

Jannette discloses, “In the display of FIG. 14, the graphic indicia are simply one of three color dots, with a red dot indicating that that particular system is not currently on track to meet that particular objective. The yellow dot indicates that obtaining the objective is in doubt, while a green dot indicates that the respective system group is currently expected to meet their respective objectives.” Jannette Column 10 lines 56-63.

It was not proper to combine Horn with Jannette because they are in non analogous arts. Horn is concerned with web browsers while Jannette is concerned with project management of manufacturing products. A computer programmer designing a web browser would not think to consult prior art concerning project management and vice versa because these are much different fields.

Moreover, Jannette does not fill the gap of Horn, even if Jannette was combined with Horn. Jannette discloses color coding, i.e. red, yellow and green, to indicate status of completion of a vehicle system. In contrast, claim 34 recites “displaying next to each of the web site names a respective graphic whose intensity corresponds to the time since last visit by said user to said each named web site”. The status of completion of a vehicle system or other product is much different than the time since last visit by a user to each named web site because they represent much different matters. Jannette pertains to production whereas claim 34 pertains to web browsing. There is not even a suggestion from Jannette that the time since last visit by a user to a web site should be graphically represented the same as status of completion of a vehicle system or other product. Time since last visit to a web site has nothing to do with completion of a vehicle system or any other product.

Moreover, the graphic representation used in Jannette is different than that in claim 34. Jannette uses a red, yellow or green dot whereas the present invention displays next to each of the web site names a respective graphic whose intensity corresponds to the time since last visit by the user to each named web site. Graphics whose intensity correspond to the time since last visit by the user to each named web site are not red, yellow and green dots. Red, yellow and green dots are color coding **based on color not intensity** as recited in claim 34.

Claim 37 depends on claims 34 and also recites that the graphics adjoin each other to form a generally rectangular region perpendicular to the web site names. This is not taught or suggested by Jannette (or Horn). Jannette discloses discrete red, yellow and green dots that do not adjoin each other to form a generally rectangular region. See Figure 14 of Jannette which illustrates discrete red, yellow and green dots. Moreover, there was no suggestion to adjoin the dots of Jannette because there would be no advantage to join the dots in a display based on pure color coding. Therefore, there is an additional reason that the rejection of claim 37 under 35 USC 103 should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 46 distinguishes over Horn and Jannette for the same reasons that independent claim 34 distinguishes thereover.

Claim 49 depends on claim 46 and further distinguishes over Horn and Jannette for the same reason that claim 37 further distinguishes over Horn and Jannette.

Independent claim 38 recites a method for displaying a web browsing history. A list of names of web sites visited by a user is displayed. The list of web site names are displayed in an order based on frequency of visits by the user. Next to each of the web site names is displayed a respective graphic whose intensity corresponds to a frequency of visits by the user to the respective named web site.

Horn discloses, “When the Include History button 32 is selected from function Home Form 28 (FIG. 10), operation of the function History 44 as set forth in the form of FIG. 11 is the result. The form displays browser history stored URLs by date visited.” Horn Paragraph [0112]. Horn does not disclose or suggest that next to each of the web site names is displayed a respective graphic whose intensity corresponds to a frequency of visits by the user to the respective named web site, as recited in claim 38. The Examiner acknowledges this gap in Horn, and cites Jannette as purportedly filling this gap.

Jannette discloses, “In the display of FIG. 14, the graphic indicia are simply one of three color dots, with a red dot indicating that that particular system is not currently on track to meet

that particular objective. The yellow dot indicates that obtaining the objective is in doubt, while a green dot indicates that the respective system group is currently expected to meet their respective objectives.” Jannette Column 10 lines 56-63.

It was not proper to combine Horn with Jannette because they are in non analogous arts. Horn is concerned with web browsers while Jannette is concerned with project management of manufacturing products. A computer programmer designing a web browser would not think to consult prior art concerning project management and vice versa because these are much different fields.

Moreover, Jannette does not fill the gap of Horn, even if Jannette was combined with Horn. Jannette discloses color coding, i.e. red, yellow and green, to indicate status of completion of a vehicle system. In contrast, claim 38 recites “displaying next to each of the web site names a respective graphic whose intensity corresponds to a frequency of visits by said user to the respective named web site”. The status of completion of a vehicle system or other product is much different than the frequency of visits by a user to the respective named web site because they represent much different matters. Jannette pertains to production whereas claim 38 pertains to web browsing. There is not even a suggestion from Jannette that the frequency of visits by a user to respective web sites should be graphically represented the same as status of completion of a vehicle system or other product. Frequency of visits to respective web sites has nothing to do with completion of a vehicle system or any other product.

Moreover, the graphic representation used in Jannette is different than that in claim 38. Jannette uses a red, yellow or green dot whereas the present invention displays next to each of the web site names a respective graphic whose intensity corresponds to the frequency of visits by a user to the respective named web site. Graphics whose intensity correspond to the frequency of visits by a user to the respective named web site are not red, yellow or green dots. Red, yellow and green dots are color coding **based on color not intensity** as recited in claim 38.

Claim 41 depends on claims 38 and recites that the graphics adjoin each other to form a generally rectangular region perpendicular to the web site names. This is not taught or suggested by Jannette (or Horn). Jannette discloses discrete red, yellow and green dots that do not adjoin

each other to form a generally rectangular region. See Figure 14 of Jannette which illustrates discrete red, yellow and green dots. Moreover, there was no suggestion to adjoin the dots of Jannette because there would be no advantage in a display based on pure color coding. Therefore, there is an additional reason that the rejection of claim 41 under 35 USC 103 should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 50 distinguishes Horn and Jannette for the same reasons that independent claim 38 distinguishes thereover.

Claim 53 depends on claim 50 and further distinguishes over Horn and Jannette for the same reason that claim 41 further distinguishes over Horn and Jannette.

Based on the foregoing, Applicant requests allowance of the present patent application as amended above.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 08/03/07
Telephone: 607-429-4368
Fax No.: 607-429-4119

/Arthur J. Samodovitz/
Arthur J. Samodovitz
Reg. No. 31,297